

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

January 24, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: Vice-Chairman Stewart Straus called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Vice-Chairman Straus; Board Members Cecilia Antonio, Hal Beighley, Mimi Doukas, Monty Edberg, Ronald Nardoza and Jennifer Shipley.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson, Senior Planner John Osterberg, Transportation Planner Don Gustafson and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

Vice-Chairman Stewart Straus read the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Vice-Chairman Straus asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

On question, staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Vice-Chairman Straus entertained nominations for the positions of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the year 2002.

Mr. Beighley **NOMINATED** Mr. Straus for the position of Chairman for the year 2002 and moved that nominations be closed.

Mr. Edberg **SECONDED** both the nomination and the motion to close nominations.

Motion that Mr. Straus serve in the capacity of Chairman for the year 2002 **CARRIED**, unanimously.

Mr. Edberg **NOMINATED** Mr. Beighley for the position of Vice-Chairman for the year 2002.

Ms. Antonio **SECONDED** the nomination.

Hearing no other nominations, Chairman Straus declared nominations closed.

Motion that Mr. Beighley serve in the capacity of Vice-Chairman for the year 2002 **CARRIED**, unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

CONTINUANCE:

Chairman Straus opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the hearing. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

Observing that her employer is involved in the BDR 2001-0155 – Home Depot at Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway Type 3 Design Review Project, Ms. Doukas recused herself from participating on this decision and left the dais.

A. BDR 2001-0155 – HOME DEPOT AT BEAVERTON/HILLSDALE HIGHWAY

(Continued from December 13, 2001)

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct two buildings. Building one is proposed to be an approximately 137,140-foot retail facility for Home Depot, and Building two is proposed to be an approximately 12,475 square foot restaurant occupied by Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza. The Home Depot proposal includes the construction of a loading facility, parking area, garden center, and associated landscaping. The Chuck E. Cheese proposal includes the loading area, parking and associated landscaping. The development proposal is located at on 4401 SW 110th Avenue; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-15AA on Tax Lot 6600. The affected parcel is zoned Community Service (CS) and is approximately 12 acres in size. A decision for action on the proposed development shall be based upon the approval criteria listed in Section 40.10.15.3.C.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson presented the Staff Report and discussed what he described as a culmination of a project that had been originally initiated at least 2-1/2 years ago with an unsuccessful application by the applicant to locate a *Home Depot* at the southeast corner of SW 5th Street and SW Western Avenue, adding that the current application involves the site of a former *Montgomery Ward's* store on SW 110th Street and SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway. He further explained that both *Home Depot* and *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* has worked with staff for approximately 6 months in an effort to create a site plan

that would be acceptable to everyone involved. Observing that he intends to keep his comments as brief as possible, he pointed out that both applicants have provided numerous visual aids and would be providing more specific details during their presentation. He discussed several revisions to the Staff Report, as follows:

- ?? Page 1, Staff Report Date – Thursday, January 17, 20042
- ?? Page 1, Footnote – Staff Report: January 17, 20042
- ?? Page 7, Proposed Parking: The parking requirement for ~~an office~~ a retail building in Zone A...
- ?? Page 23, Condition of Approval No. 22: The awning color of the Chuck E. Cheese restaurant building shall be ~~a~~ changed to a color...

Mr. Ryerson discussed the request for design review approval for two buildings at the former *Montgomery Ward's* retail building and existing *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* restaurant site. He pointed out that *Home Depot* is requesting an approximately 116,000 square foot retail building, with an approximately 20,000 square foot garden center, and that *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* is requesting an approximately 12,500 square foot building, with an overall site plan showing the retail and its parking lot to be located at the southerly end of the approximately 12.5 acre site and the restaurant to be sited at the northerly end of the property. Observing that this is an interesting piece of property, Mr. Ryerson pointed out that the site is cornered by four major arterials and collector streets within the City of Beaverton and is visible from Highway 217. He emphasized that the proposal involves a building that would be visible from all four sides, noting that the applicant team has done a good job of providing for a building articulation that shows some interest and definition. He mentioned that there had also been issues with regard to building site orientation, specifically noting that the building would be located up against SW Beaverton/ Hillsdale Highway.

Referring to intersection control and improvements, Mr. Ryerson pointed out that issues with regard to the intersections of SW 109th Avenue and SW 110th Avenue with SW Canyon Road had been addressed and resolved. He discussed a building encroachment dispute, observing that this had been addressed by the applicant and is currently in the process of being resolved. He discussed the proposed site grading and retaining wall along the southwesterly edge of the site, noting that since the rear of the building would be facing SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, staff has suggested that heavy green vegetative screening along the southwest property line should be included.

Mr. Ryerson mentioned an attempt on the part of staff to make both applicant teams aware of their desire to retain the London Plain Trees along SW 110th Avenue. Referring to the proposed garden center, he noted that this garden center would be located on the east side of the *Home Depot* building, adding that they had been successful in their attempt to match the garden center with their proposed building by providing some attractive columns with brick and rock

veneer, as found throughout the building. He submitted materials boards, as follows:

1. Colors and veneers of the *Home Depot* building;
2. Brick wainscot on the *Home Depot* Building;
3. Rock veneer along the columns of the building and the garden center. He noted that the applicant is attempting to tie the rocks into the feature on the site itself, specifically the retaining wall at the southwesterly corner of the site. He mentioned that in addition to the Columbia basalt boulders that are proposed at the retaining wall, bands of basalt would be provided along the south property line, going from the heavy vegetation and shrubs to the ground covers along SW Beaverton Hillsdale Highway;
4. Two retaining walls along SW 110th Avenue; one near the garden center and the second at the intersection of Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway and Highway 217, in which a segmental block wall is proposed, with three different colors of khaki, natural and charcoal which would be tied in with the basalt feature at the intersection;
5. The garden center fence; and
6. *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* materials board. He pointed out that one of the Conditions of Approval deals with the awning color of the building, which is currently a bright red. He mentioned that staff had recommended that the awning be a color similar to the recessed circular round accent of the *Home Depot* building. Noting that these recessed areas are a wineberry color, he clarified that *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* is proposing a burgundy color for their awnings.

Mr. Ryerson referred to 3 correspondences that had been received with regard to this proposal, observing that all are included within the exhibits of the Staff Report. Concluding, he recommended approval of the application, subject to certain Conditions of Approval, and offered to respond to questions and comments.

Chairman Straus referred to the setback of *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* from the freeway ramp, observing that it seems fairly small at one corner, requesting clarification of the setback and how it relates to applicable requirements.

Mr. Ryerson explained that early discussions with the applicant clarified which street would be the front of the building and which would be the sides, noting that the Planning Director had determined that the front of the buildings would be located on SW 110th Avenue, adding that the Highway 217 frontage would be considered at the rear setback. Observing that the Community Service (CS)

zone does not provide for a setback requirement for a rear setback unless it abuts a residentially zoned property, he clarified that no rear setback is required in order to meet the Development Code.

Ms. Shipley referred to the last paragraph of page 15 of the Staff Report, which states that existing vegetation will not be retained along SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway and that the applicant would replace this vegetation with native plantings. She questioned whether the native plantings are a requirement that had been determined by staff.

Mr. Ryerson explained that throughout the design of the project, it had become apparent that it would be necessary to provide some screening of the back of the *Home Depot* building facing the intersection of SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway and Highway 217. A discussion with regard to the type of building and vegetation that would be located here had involved the possibility of a northwest vernacular, adding that the *Home Depot* team had proposed the introduction of the Columbia basalt into the retaining wall and tied it into rock veneer at the columns, as well as native landscaping. He pointed out that the original and current landscape plans are very different, adding that it had been possible to provide for a lot more vegetation and enhancement of the buffer with a native type of vegetation.

Ms. Shipley questioned how specific the intent of the term native vegetation is with regard to this application, expressing her opinion while many of the trees are native, many of the shrubs and ground cover layers are not native by purist definition.

Mr. Ryerson advised Ms. Shipley that although the native landscaping is not an actual requirement, the landscape architect team is attempting a native-type of landscaping, adding that the landscape architect is available to address any questions or comments.

APPLICANT:

FRANK PARISI, the attorney representing *Home Depot, Inc.*, expressed appreciation to staff and introduced himself and the following members of the applicant team: 1) Julia Kuhn Butorac, Traffic Engineer representing *Kittelson & Associates*; 2) Tom Pessemier, representing *WRG Design*; 3) Steve Capilouto, architect for *Home Depot, Inc.*, 4) Jeffrey Simpson, Landscape Architect for *WRG Design*; and 5) Robert Klas, Architect representing *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza*, adding that each of these individuals would be making a presentation and responding to questions with regard to their involvement in the proposal. Emphasizing that the proposal is within a Community Service Zone that allows large scale automobile oriented retail trade similar in scale to the shopping centers located on Highway 217, SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway and SW Canyon Road, he briefly discussed the application and issues related to the

project, including the City of Beaverton's recommendation to locate the store at this location. Observing that this involves a challenging site, he pointed out that the property is long and narrow and includes a property with an existing lease (*Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza*), adding that the challenges on this site had resulted in 20 different site plans. He pointed out that the applicant had finally found a site plan that would work, emphasizing that Mr. Ryerson and the Facilities Review Committee had found this site plan acceptable as well. Concluding, he mentioned that the project had received a great deal of support from the various Neighborhood Associations, and urged that a decision be made tonight to allow the applicant to have this facility ready for business by the summer of 2003.

JULIA KUHN BUTORAC, Traffic Engineer representing *Kittelson & Associates*, mentioned that *Home Depot, Inc.* had retained her firm to provide a traffic impact analysis for the proposed store, adding that the analysis had focused upon two aspects related to site development, including the off-site improvement needs and the on-site circulation access.

Referring to the off-site perspective, Ms. Butorac noted that the redevelopment of this site offers a number of challenges, which are primarily related to the fact that several of the roads surrounding the site are not owned by the City of Beaverton. She explained that both SW 109th Avenue and SW 110th Avenue are owned by Washington County and that SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway and SW Canyon Road are ODOT facilities. She pointed out that several unusual intersection configurations exist at the intersections of SW 109th Avenue and SW 110th Avenue. Observing that these issues had resulted in several months of meetings with ODOT, Washington County and the City of Beaverton in order to identify transportation improvements that would meet the needs of all of the agencies and parties involved, she explained that a number of improvements that need to be constructed by *Home Depot, Inc.* to facilitate improved pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicular movement around the site had been identified.

Referring to an illustration depicting the north end of the site, Ms. Butorac discussed the SW Canyon Road/SW 110th Avenue intersection, observing that a curb would be installed along the west side of the street in front of the *Standard Appliance* property. Observing that this basically involves one big driveway with little delineation, she noted that Washington County has indicated that they would like the applicant to install a curb with a driveway leading to the off-site parking for *Standard Appliance*. She pointed out that the on-site parking currently encroaches into the right-of-way, adding that this issue should be addressed by Washington County. She mentioned that a sidewalk would be constructed on the east side of SW 110th Avenue, from SW Canyon Road into the access of the car lot, observing that this would provide a safe and interim place for pedestrians to walk and that ultimately, the entire area would include sidewalks. She noted that both a left turn lane and right turn would be constructed at the intersection of SW 110th Avenue, observing that this space is necessary from a queuing standpoint, in order to provide for two lanes in the

northbound direction. Explaining that this would mirror what is occurring in the southbound lane, she mentioned that this would allow the left turns to operate at the same time. She pointed out that this intersection is slightly odd at the present time, emphasizing that improvements are anticipated that would address problems at the intersection and minimize driver confusion.

Ms. Butorac explained that proposed improvements include the removal of the stop sign at the southbound approach, noting that at the present time, a vehicle must stop to turn left but not to turn right, and that there is not adequate room for a vehicle to get around a vehicle turning left towards *Target*. She explained that with the removal of this stop sign, another stop sign would be installed on SW 110th Avenue traveling this direction, emphasizing that this would provide clear delineation for SW 110th Avenue at SW Canyon Road southbound. She mentioned that the applicant also proposes to provide some curb extensions, adding that this would minimize driver confusion and provide more appropriate delineation of where everyone is supposed to go. She explained the proposal to remove the on street parking along SW 110th Street on the applicant's side of the road only, adding that they had conducted some windshield surveys and found that the on street parking is actually related to the park and ride that exists in the area. She pointed out that the on street parking on the east side of the street would not be removed, noting that it is utilized by businesses located in the area. Emphasizing that the removal of some of the on street parking would actually help to provide improved site distance between each of the driveways, as well as eliminate some of the conflicts.

Observing that the applicant had been discussing issues with regard to SW 110th Avenue with *Tri-Met*, Ms. Butorac noted that they are proposing to install a bus stop and shelter just to the north of the *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* driveway. Referring to the site frontage along SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, she noted that a right turn lane would be constructed to provide additional queue storage and relieve some of the congestion at the Highway 217 on-ramp. Noting that ODOT actually has a maintenance and preservation project on SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, she explained that they intend to do some repaving and upgrading of signals, as well as reconstruction of sidewalks. She commented that the applicant had met with representatives of ODOT recently in an effort to coordinate projects and eliminate duplications, adding that once all proposed improvements are in place, the intersections would operate within an acceptable level of service. Emphasizing that it has taken a great deal of time to reach this point, she expressed her opinion that it is possible to comfortably meet the needs of ODOT, Washington County, the City of Beaverton and the applicant.

Noting that she would like to provide a brief overview of the site circulation access, Ms. Butorac indicated that this had provided the greatest challenge involved in the proposal. Explaining that the site offers several constraints, she noted that Mr. Parisi had described several of these issues, adding that due to the

fact that Highway 217 would be *Home Depot's* back yard, it is necessary to address the parking issues. She noted that the original site plan placed the store in a different portion of the site, adding that the previous occupant of the site had the potential to generate as much or more traffic as *Home Depot*. She pointed out that conversations with Washington County and ODOT had quickly confirmed that this particular driveway would be denied, adding that it would be treated as a completely new access permit application, which falls within what they refer to as the "interchange management area", which provides for a certain spacing from interchange ramps with no access whatsoever. She explained that a land use decision would allow them to reconsider the access points, adding that ODOT had advised the applicant that they would not allow this accessing and that it would be necessary to return with a site plan indicating access off of SW 110th Avenue only.

Observing that several different scenarios had been considered, Ms. Butorac discussed one that had proposed to keep the store and parking field in its current location, with one access point into SW 110th Avenue. She emphasized that the site has some constraints related to elevations and grading, noting that access had to remain within about 300 feet of the traffic signal. Pointing out that the traffic signal has queues to back up, she stated that those queues are approximately 250 feet, which would not allow access closer than 250 feet or further than 300 feet. She mentioned that although the plan that had been created is not ideal, the applicant had determined that it would work for them, although there would be some congestion in the parking lot. She noted that the applicant had presented this plan to both the City of Beaverton and Washington County, adding that Washington County had opposed the plan. She explained that Washington County had determined that one access into *Home Depot* is contrary to driver expectations, emphasizing that customers actually expect more than one access point. She mentioned that drivers would be turning around in *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza's* lot and utilizing SW 110th Avenue for site circulation, adding that this is not the intent of SW 110th Avenue.

Ms. Butorac explained that another issue involves potentially locating *Home Depot* with its back to *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza*, adding that this could create a buffer that would discourage pedestrian travel between the two sites and cause people to drive between the two sites. She discussed the proposed site plan, observing that the applicant team, ODOT, Washington County and the City of Beaverton all feel comfortable that this plan would meet everybody's access needs and allow for necessary off-site improvements.

Referring to some of the highlights that she considers particularly attractive, Ms. Butorac pointed out that there would be pedestrian access within the site out to SW Canyon Road and that there would be attractive pedestrian pathways connecting *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* to *Home Depot*, as well as out to SW 110th Avenue. She emphasized that both *Home Depot* and *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* would be able to share the parking area as well as access points, adding that

pedestrians could easily travel between both sites. Concluding, she offered to respond to any questions.

Referring to the proposed elimination of the park-and-ride on SW 110th Avenue, Mr. Beighley questioned how this would affect *Tri-Met*.

Ms. Butorac informed Mr. Beighley that this park-and-ride would actually be closed, adding that alternative sites, including the *Home Base* site, are being considered.

TOM PESSEMIER, representing *WRG Design*, observed that his firm is providing civil engineering services for this project, adding that they have worked closely with staff and the Facilities Review Committee throughout the evolution of this project in order to ensure that all civil site issues have been addressed. He provided a explanation of the results of these efforts and the civil engineering design and briefly described the grading for the site. Noting that the existing building is at an elevation of 199 feet above mean sea level and is located towards the middle of the site, he mentioned that the grading from the building slopes down to the southwest and northwest of the site, which are the lowest points on the site. Observing that the elevation of SW 110th Avenue is 3 to 8 feet higher than the existing development, he pointed out that this involved considerable constraint in the design of the grading for the project. He noted that the existing building varies between 40.8 feet and 26.5 feet in height, adding that the proposed building is 35 feet in height and the footprints of both proposed buildings is less than that of the existing building. He explained that this basically indicates that the massing of both the *Home Depot* and *Chuck E. Cheese's Pizza* buildings would be less than that of the former *Montgomery Ward* building. Pointing out that in developing a grading plan for the site, *WRG Design* worked with the City of Beaverton, emphasizing that the first and most critical objective had been to maintain the existing trees along the SW 110th Avenue and Highway 217 frontage road, adding that in order to meet these objectives, the landscaping wall along SW 110th Avenue could not exceed 4 feet in height. He explained that a taller wall would require excavation and tiebacks into the existing slope, which would have endangered the trees along SW 110th Avenue, adding that the preservation of these trees is a priority. He mentioned that the applicant has proposed a landscape wall along SW 110th Avenue, adding that this 4-foot wall would run basically along the side of the store, eventually dropping down to approximately 2-feet in height. He pointed out that due to this 4-foot high wall, the applicant could not lower the *Home Depot* building below 199 feet of mean sea level, which is exactly the same elevation as the existing structure, adding that this required the retaining wall along Highway 217. Observing that this wall had been designed to minimize the potential impacts and preserve the existing trees, he stated that the wall basically runs along the entire west side of the store and includes some landscaping features which would be described by the landscaper.

Mr. Pessemier discussed efforts to recycle materials from the existing *Montgomery Ward* building, while attempting to maintain a balanced cut and fill for the project. Observing that the existing structure includes approximately 1500 dump truck loads of recycle material that could be utilized on the site, he pointed out that rather than filling up the local landfills, the applicant has proposed to attempt to reutilize these materials on the site. He mentioned that the existing soils are acceptable as structural fill, adding that they would be extremely difficult to place during the wet weather season, which is when the applicant anticipates the project would be completed. For this reason, he stated that the applicant has considered removal of a portion of the existing soil and using some of the recycle materials in place of it. In order to maintain a balance of material, it had been necessary to set a finished floor with an elevation of no lower than 199 feet above mean sea level, emphasizing that a lower elevation would require significant removal of the existing soils and recycled material.

Mr. Pessemier mentioned that the applicant had attempted to maintain ADA approved requirements for the site, adding that it had been determined that in order to maintain ADA access, matching the floor of the existing structure would work best and would not require modification of ramps or handrails to meet any ADA requirements. He mentioned that the proposed retaining wall along Highway 217 would be engineered by *Landau and Associates*, a civil engineering group that specializes in the design of retaining walls. Observing that these walls would be designed to incorporate all of the state building codes and take any additional traffic loads. He described the appearance of the proposed wall, observing that the applicant has proposed a modular block wall that would meet the structural requirements and maintain the northwest look, which would be discussed by the landscape architect. Observing that the site has been well developed in the past, he noted that all utilities are in place and that this project would reduce the amount of impervious area on the site, as well as providing appropriate detention to meet the standards of both the City of Beaverton and Clean Water Services (CWS). He emphasized that the runoff from the site would be less than the runoff currently generated by the site, adding that the storm water would ultimately fall into the existing pipes that enter the ODOT right-of-way on both the north and south ends of the project. Observing that the site is ecologically friendly due to the reutilization of materials currently existing on the site, he reiterated that the applicant intends to maintain the existing floor from the *Montgomery Ward* building in order to provide for optimal grading. Concluding, he concurred with the Conditions of Approval recommended by staff and offered to respond to questions.

Mr. Edberg pointed out that storm water quality features are not apparent on the site and questioned whether a regional facility is available.

Mr. Pessemier pointed out that because this site is actually reducing the amount of impervious area from the site, Code requirements for additional water quality measures do not apply.

Observing that no retaining walls exist on the current site, Ms. Antonio requested clarification of what necessitates the retaining walls.

Mr. Pessemier advised Ms. Antonio that the requirement for retaining walls has a lot to do with the siting of the existing building, adding that the existing building is situated much more towards one side of the project. He pointed out that because the proposal would move the building so much further toward the center of the project, grading would be required along the sides of the project towards the northwest.

Chairman Straus referred to Mr. Pessemier's comments regarding the recycling of materials, and requested clarification of whether the existing concrete would be chopped up into pieces and buried.

Mr. Pessemier informed Chairman Straus that the existing concrete would be essentially ground up into a size that would be structurally acceptable as a natural fill.

Ms. Shipley questioned whether the concrete would be crushed on site and how long this procedure would take.

Mr. Pessemier responded that the concrete would most likely be crushed on site, and assured her that while it would be more profitable to complete this process as quickly as possible, this would not be done beyond normal construction hours.

STEVE CAPILOUTO, architect for *Home Depot, Inc.*, expressed appreciation to staff for their cooperation and assistance in the development of this project. Pointing out that this building must be attractive from all visible points, he provided illustrations of the indoor lumber canopy and entryway to the garden center. He explained that he had attempted to denote that entry by projections, dimensions and color schemes, accents, trellis work and popouts in order to provide texture to the recessed area. He pointed out that he had also attempted to integrate the garden center, which is a prominent area of the building, adding that this would be made an integral part of the building as well. He mentioned that he had provided a sample of the wrought iron proposed for the fencing, adding that this would provide for some detail beyond the 4-inch standard picket on the front. He discussed the outdoor sales area, noting that this would include 4-foot sections that could be stored within the store when they are not being utilized when the seasonal sales are not an issue. Referring to the area facing SW 110th Avenue, he pointed out that this is the prominent part of the garden center and described the details and features he had proposed for this area.

Expressing his opinion that the proposal looks great, Chairman Straus noted that he is concerned with the expanse of roof that would potentially be viewed from

Highway 217. Observing that there might be some 3-dimensional quality to this feature, he noted that it is not apparent in the plans.

Observing that no portion of this building should be visible from Highway 217, Mr. Capilouto discussed the rooftop equipment, including ventilators; smoke shafts and skylights, noting that all would be hidden behind the parapet.

Mr. Pessemier indicated that due to the elevation of the northbound lane of Highway 217 and the parapet wall, the building would not be visible from the vehicles.

Observing that he is certain that there must be a slope to the roof, Chairman Straus requested clarification of the minimum and maximum dimensions from the top of the parapet to the roof.

Mr. Capilouto responded that he believes that the maximum dimension is 14-feet at the lower end and the minimum dimension is approximately 10-feet at the upper end.

Chairman Straus noted that with the parapet extending 14-feet above the roof, it would be possible to locate another store up there.

JEFFREY K. SIMPSON, Landscape Architect for *WRG Design*, explained that this proposal is the result of months of collaboration with staff. Observing that he would like to address two aspects of planting design, including the integration of existing valued landscape elements. He provided an illustration of some of the existing landscaping surrounding the site, noting that an arborist's report is included within the application. Pointing to a view of the southwest corner of the site, he referred to the existing sweet gums lining the frontage road that parallels Highway 217. He referred to the southeast corner heading west on Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, specifically the London Plain Trees that line the entire length of SW 110th Avenue. Emphasizing that the applicant would like to attempt to integrate the proposed landscaping into the existing landscaping, he discussed the riparian area that borders Hall Creek, adding that there are currently some attractive and fully matured canopies covering almost the entire site. He pointed out that the problem is that the under story is a mess, noting that this is an area in which people have camped out, leaving behind makeshift tents and piles of debris. He mentioned that the proposal includes cleaning up this area and adding some riparian vegetation, including some Douglas Fir and Big Leaf Maple, Snowberry, Red Current and Honious Sword Fern, adding that the area would be reseeded with a riparian seed mix that requires very low maintenance.

Referring to the existing treescape along SW 110th Avenue, Mr. Simpson discussed what he considers very fine specimens of London Plain Trees, some of which are 20-inch caliper trees, ranging upwards in height of 50-feet. He

mentioned that the arborist's report details the condition of those trees as good, although they are diseased with an insect that is treatable, adding that minor maintenance would resolve any health issues. Emphasizing that the applicant would like to preserve as much of the existing trees as possible, he noted that the design team had considered this one of the most valuable existing landscape features on the site. Emphasizing that these trees provide an attractive, canopied and shaded walkway for pedestrians, he pointed out they also shade the parking lot and would lend a significant amount of visual balance to the site in terms of the scale of those trees and the proposed project.

Mr. Simpson referred to the sweet gums along the western property line, observing that although the subject property is quite narrow along the eastern side, there is some additional property (ODOT right-of-way) between the applicant's property and the edge of paper. He mentioned that there is some existing plant material in both the subject property and the right-of-way, emphasizing that the right-of-way material would not be disturbed. He emphasized that the wall design along the property is very respectful of the existing trees, noting that in cooperation with staff, the applicant had determined a variety of options and solutions to address this retaining wall in order to mitigate loads on root systems, as well as other issues. He stated that a lot of time and effort had gone into determining methods that would create the least amount of impact to the trees.

Mr. Simpson pointed out that the arborist report quantifies all of the trees currently existing on the site, adding that this total of 119 includes trees within the interior of the project (parking lot trees). He mentioned that the arborist has recommended removal of approximately 24% of the 119 trees, noting that the majority of these trees are located within the interior of the parking lot. Noting that the proposal would provide slightly more than twice the number of trees existing on the site at this time, he emphasized that the proposal would provide for a significant improvement. Observing that the applicant would remove and replace several trees along SW 110th Avenue with similar trees, he noted that several other trees would be removed in order to provide adequate access to the site.

Referring to the proposed planting, landscape design and landscape composition, Mr. Simpson mentioned that staff had expressed an interest in the opportunity this project afforded to the City of Beaverton in terms of themes. Observing that some fairly prominent intersections and corridors are located in this area, he reiterated Mr. Ryerson's statement that the main access off of Highway 217 entering the City of Beaverton is at this point, which is the first point of contact many individuals have with the City of Beaverton. Native plant material might not be 100% what you want to use, incorporate with other ornamental indigenous materials, not rigid landscape design. Noting that the applicant had suggested a Northwest Theme, he pointed out that although native plant material might not be exactly what a developer would like to use for 100%

of the site, they have incorporated a small amount of what they would term native plant material with other indigenous materials to Oregon that are slightly more on the ornamental side. He emphasized that the idea is for this to be done very naturally, adding that this should not be what he considers a rigid landscape design. Pointing out that the parking lots do not provide much of an opportunity for a great deal of flexibility, he stated that large canopy trees have been incorporated in a fashion that starts to communicate a hierarchy of movement through the site for vehicles. He mentioned that circulation patterns throughout the parking lot are representative of another species of tree, adding that the interior trees, in the parking area, are largely a third type of tree, in an effort to create a visual hierarchy throughout the parking lot to provide direction to drivers.

Mr. Simpson discussed what he described as a key point in the project, specifically the landscaping for the frontage along Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway. He referred to an interest on the part of the City of Beaverton to create some sort of special landscape architectural feature, noting that this had been originally initiated in a conversation with regard to the intersection. He mentioned that this proposed feature involves a treatment that could be extended along the entire frontage to create a special effect. He noted that this concept has been referred to as landscape architectural sculptural elements, which serve no real function, other than to provide a sculptural piece of art within the landscape. Observing that Mr. Ryerson had referred to a series of landscapes throughout the area that the City of Beaverton prefers, he mentioned that an evaluation was conducted of these specific sites. Noting that several of these sites included similar elements, such as sculptural pieces within the landscaping that had been created from native or indigenous materials, he stated that the applicant had come up with a solution including massive, but rigid and articulate masses of stone. He noted that the idea was to frame these corners and establish some mass and statement that is in context with the urban scale of the entire area. Observing that consideration had been given to several different options that might achieve this purpose, he noted that it had been determined that the solution had been to use projections that would actually hug the grade of the berm of the slope, in a very articulate fashion, with an appearance of masonry features. He pointed out that there are also some grading issues, noting that the high point is approximately 7 feet.

Emphasizing the effort that had gone into preservation of the trees, Mr. Simpson mentioned that consideration had been given towards numerous options of transitioning the boulder wall into the segmental wall. He pointed out that the idea had been to terminate the boulder wall at the end of the drip line, install a section of segmental retaining wall, another section of boulder wall, another section of segmental wall, in a series throughout the length of approximately 100 to 150 feet, in order to skip over the root systems. He explained that this pattern would transition from this hopscotch segmental boulder arrangement into the segmental arrangement only within this zone. Noting that his one issue

with the segmental wall involves the monotone, one-color wall, which he does not consider very attractive, he pointed out that the applicant had worked with the manufacturer to create a blend of wall material arranged in a fashion in which a contractor can chose the taupe color in a 60% gray, a 20% charcoal and a 20% mixture, in order to accent and pick up on the Columbia River basalt boulders and stonework. Emphasizing that this feature must be tied into the building subtly, he mentioned that this material had been tied into the bases of the columns on the building itself.

Referring to the planting design and focusing along the SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway frontage, Mr. Simpson noted that the applicant had created a tiered, layered effect, in terms of how both vehicular drivers and pedestrians would view this frontage. He pointed out that the landscape plan integrates large masses of groundcover materials, ornamental grasses and shrub materials, in different heights, to create a hierarchy of material up the hillside, emphasizing that this adds interest, color, texture and foliage. He mentioned that the plantings include two varieties of fountain grass, with a dense planting of conifers at the top of the slope, adding that Conditions of Approval proposed by staff provide for 8-foot, 10-foot and 12-foot materials. He provided a prospective drawing of the view north along the Highway 217 frontage road, referring to the existing Sweet Gum trees, at their current height and maturity, noting that the these would create a tiered effect along with the low ground cover up front. He mentioned that the proposal also includes shrubs, Mountain Laurel, Artic Blue Leaf Willow and Nandina, in an effort to create a garden atmosphere, emphasizing that this will not have the appearance of a typical big box retail facility.

Mr. Simpson discussed the tree height three years from installation, pointing out that the enlarged blowups clearly illustrate the features and details of the site. He described how the various tiers and levels of the landscaping would be integrated in order to work with the features, observing that this treatment occurs throughout the frontage of the property. Referring to the most visible corner where vehicles would be exiting off of Highway 217, he pointed out that there would be three or four levels or depths of vertical confers, emphasizing that this intersection and corner would be very densely vegetated. He discussed landscaping elements that have been tied into the building itself, pointing out that greenery would be visibly growing on the building. He described the trelliswork that has been designed into the façade, noting that clematis would be planted on the trellises. Observing that the entire project would be provided with an automated irrigation system, including a drip for the clematis. Concluding, he expressed his appreciation to staff and offered to respond to questions or comments.

Referring to the sculptural features, Ms. Shipley questioned whether an individual who is unaware of the architectural intention that is occurring here

would view this as the base of a wall that has not been completed, a drain outfall or even a burial mound.

Agreeing that art is in the eye of the beholder, Mr. Simpson expressed his opinion that often controversy leads to success. Observing that it is the goal of the design team to detail such a project in what appears to be precise and deliberate, he noted that the edges should be edges and the corners should be corners.

Ms. Shipley referred to the perennial mix located at the corner, and requested more specification as to what this perennial mix might consist of and whether this would disappear, like most perennials, in the wintertime.

Agreeing that exposure issues exist at that corner, Mr. Simpson assured Ms. Shipley that the applicant would review the preferred list of perennials with the intention of planting a variety of bulbs that would result in different views throughout the various seasons, emphasizing that there would always be some type of plant life in that area.

Ms. Shipley mentioned the Big Leaf Maples, requesting clarification of what size these trees would be at the time of planting.

Mr. Simpson advised Ms. Shipley that he anticipates that the Big Leaf Maples would be planted in the 3-gallon or 5-gallon size, adding that the ultimate mature tree would represent 30% to 40% of what is shown at this time, expressing his opinion that this would be appropriate, in terms of spacing and size, adding that this particular plant grows like a weed. He assured her that the spacing of the plants would be determined with the existing plants, trees and drip lines in mind.

Referring to the riparian wilderness area, Ms. Antonio requested clarification of whether the plants would be the shorter, shrubbier varieties that would discourage individuals from sleeping in the area.

Observing that this area appears to have been heavily used for this type of activity, Mr. Simpson informed Ms. Antonio that the applicant intends to plant varieties of plants that would discourage partying and camping in the area.

Mr. Beighley referred to the service access to the back of the building, requesting clarification of how the semi-trucks would enter and exit the site.

Ms. Butorac indicated the ingress only access on the illustration, showing that the trucks would enter off of SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway or off of SW 110th Avenue, circulate around to front of store, and egress out through the main driveway. She emphasized that due to concerns that the access is located so

near the intersection and the ability to provide egress, the area would be signed as ingress only.

Mr. Beighley suggested that this same issue be considered at the Home Depot located on SW Murray Road, noting that it might be a good idea to locate two big boulders on the corners entering the site.

Mr. Pessemier referred to Exhibit F-3 and a program he referred to as “Auto Turn”, observing that it has been determined that there is plenty of width at this point to allow the trucks to enter and exit the site.

Chairman Straus questioned whether the “Auto Turn” program factors in sleeplessness and road rage.

Mr. Pessemier explained that this program is very conservative, adding that the applicant feels very comfortable that this plan will work at this location.

Chairman Straus requested clarification of how the truck drivers would be convinced that they should not exit at that particular location.

Mr. Pessemier advised Chairman Straus that the area would be signed to provide appropriate direction to the truck drivers.

Observing that some truck drivers don't read very well, Chairman Straus suggested the possibility of installing measures that would inflict severe tire damage for those who do not comply.

Mr. Pessemier pointed out that trucks would essentially be unable to turn back around and exit at the same location they entered from.

Chairman Straus emphasized that this merely provides a challenge, rather than a concern or a deterrent.

Noting that he approves of what has been proposed along Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, Mr. Beighley expressed his opinion that this would add some interest, although he is certain there will be many questions. He mentioned concern with the landscape maintenance, emphasizing that this maintenance needs to be ongoing.

Mr. Simpson advised Mr. Beighley that the perennials are being limited to a certain extent, adding that continued maintenance would be provided.

Mr. Beighley referred to Condition of Approval No. 21, which addresses trees that are to be planted, and questioned whether this is in addition to what has been shown here tonight.

Mr. Ryerson informed Mr. Beighley that this would replace what is on the landscape plan, noting that Western Red Cedars would be added at a 2 to 1 ratio over the Colorado Spruce.

On question, Mr. Simpson informed Mr. Beighley that he is comfortable with Condition of Approval No. 21.

ROBERT KLAS, the architect representing *Chuck E. Cheese's*, pointed out that his client has operated in this building for 11 years, adding that the McGinnis family, who operates this business, has operated in this community for many years. He discussed this project, which provides his client with the opportunity for a new building that has been designed completely for their activity, with the exception of their standard exterior. He described upgrades, which include adding an arched feature to the west wall facing 217, a brick wainscot all around the building, and changes from the standard red and yellow signature awnings to burgundy. He referred to the proposal as a symbiotic project, observing that while Mom and the kids are at *Chuck E. Cheese's*, Dad can take care of his business at *Home Depot*. Concluding, he concurred with the proposed Conditions of Approval, expressed appreciation to staff, and offered to respond to questions and comments.

Ms. Antonio requested clarification of how *Chuck E. Cheese's* bright red and yellow signs and logos would work with the proposed maroon awnings.

Mr. Klas informed Ms. Antonio that the logos would be located in the arched areas, adding that the *Chuck E. Cheese's* signs would be located elsewhere and that all City requirements would be met.

Ms. Antonio expressed her opinion that the red would clash with the burgundy, and questioned whether the color of the signs had been revised.

Mr. Klas commented that he does not believe that the color of the signs had been revised.

Mr. Beighley questioned whether the mechanical units would be located below a parapet.

Mr. Klas agreed that the mechanical units would be located below a parapet and concealed.

Chairman Straus requested an explanation of the relative scale of the building elevations for *Chuck E. Cheese's* compared to those of *Home Depot*, observing that they are obviously drawn at different scales. He pointed out that he would like an understanding of how the different modular elements of each building relate to those of the other building, as well as the similarities and differences of the buildings.

Mr. Klas pointed out that the *Chuck E. Cheese's* building is approximately 20 feet high at the corners and 2 to 3 feet higher at the top of the arch, adding that the building is smaller than the *Home Depot* building.

Mr. Parisi stated that this concludes the applicant's presentation, adding that the entire applicant team would be available to respond to any questions.

8:24 p.m. to 8:35 p.m. – recess.

Chairman Straus reminded those individuals who intend to testify that it is necessary to address specific approval criteria listed in the Staff Report in order to allow the applicant to respond appropriately.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

JERRY CONDRAY congratulated the applicant and engineer for their successful efforts in designing this facility, adding that as the owner of 2 office buildings across the street from the proposed development, he is concerned with his retirement investment. Observing that both *Montgomery Wards* and *Chuck E. Cheese's* have been good neighbors, he noted while he has been concerned with what occurs at the site, he is happy that *Home Depot* has selected this site and is certain that he will have yet another good corporate neighbor. He mentioned that on the advice of Mr. Ryerson, he had contacted the developer, *WRG Design*, who had provided him a map that indicated where the proposed entrance would be located, at which time he had become concerned with the change from the existing entrances. He explained that the reason for his concern is that the one entrance to the site would be located directly across from the one entrance to his building, noting that a customer heading south would be unable to turn left into his property. Illustrating his position on the map, he pointed out that he is concerned with the potential loss of value to his property. Noting that he owns a building that is occupied by doctors and psychiatrists and other professionals, he mentioned that their customers must have the ability to access the property and park. He commented that other property owners in the area share his concerns, emphasizing that they had not originally realized that the building and entrances would change.

Chairman Straus questioned whether Mr. Condray had discussed with either *WRG Design* or *Home Depot* the possibility of utilizing parking within their premises in some manner.

Mr. Condray advised Chairman Straus that although he can only speak for himself and not other property owners in the area and he has not yet discussed parking with the applicant, he would love to have the opportunity to determine a compromise in an effort to compensate for his lost access and parking.

JAMES L. TYREE, II mentioned that he is a former resident of Portland who has recently moved to the Scholls Apartments near the Raleigh Hills Elementary School. He noted that as a resident of the area since 1984, and although he is aware of the economic benefit of this proposal, he is concerned with local traffic congestion and the water quality of Hall Creek. He expressed his opinion that the runoff of oil from the additional vehicles would have a negative impact on Hall Creek, adding that some sort of water filtration system should be installed.

WEBB HARRINGTON mentioned that he is a retired CPA and that he is here on behalf of his daughter, Jennifer Harrington, an attorney who owns the property located at 4180 SW 110th Avenue. He explained that she has the same concerns as Jerry Condray, adding that she should be included in any discussions with the applicant with regard to utilizing some of their parking. He mentioned that several other property owners share these same concerns and include in discussions, specifically accountants *Peck Kopacek PC*, share these concerns, emphasizing that their clientele particularly needs access and parking during tax return season.

Mr. Nardozza requested clarification of whether Ms. Harrington's clients need to access the building during the standard business hours Monday through Friday, or whether she works evenings as well.

Mr. Harrington advised Mr. Nardozza that although Ms. Harrington's clients would access the building during standard business hours, she personally works extended hours as well.

Mr. Tyree pointed out that as a landscape maintenance professional, he has special concerns with the architectural design that has been proposed for the site. He pointed out that a design is often created without fully considering the maintenance that would be involved, suggesting that the rock wall should have a concrete base, noting that turf should be placed in such a way that the mowing is not inconvenient, which results in the deterioration of the turf and the landscaping overall.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL:

Mr. Perisi addressed Mr. Harrington and Mr. Condray's concerns, assuring them that *Home Depot* would accommodate their customer parking to the extent that they have been dislocated, adding that they could meet with them and work out necessary arrangements for certain amounts of parking availability at certain times.

Chairman Straus suggested the possibility of imposing a Condition of Approval that designates a certain amount of parking spaces for adjoining property owners.

Mr. Parisi advised Chairman Straus that although his client would have no problem designating a certain amount of parking for the adjoining property owners, he is reluctant to get into a situation in which *Home Depot* would be obligated to provide parking in the event that their current building is torn down and replaced with a high rise.

Chairman Straus suggested that a specific number of parking spaces should be identified as having been eliminated from SW 110th Avenue.

Ms. Butorac mentioned that parking is currently allowed along the entire section of SW 110th Avenue, adding that while this number can be identified, she does not have the figures available at this time. She pointed out that it had been determined that all of the spaces on this street that are available at this time are not being utilized.

Chairman Straus referred to the studies that had been done with regard to the one main entrance to the parking area from SW 110th Avenue, and questioned whether any type of analysis had been done to indicate the probability of queuing that would prevent access to the businesses on opposite side of the street.

Ms. Butorac advised Chairman Straus that this analysis had been done, observing that Washington County requires what she referred to as an Access Modification Report, noting that several accesses are located with close proximity to each of the different driveways. She clarified that it is necessary to indicate from an operations and safety standpoint that there are no conflicts between the driveways, adding that they had considered the 95th percentile queue during peak periods, which means that only 5% of the time this worst case scenario might occur. She clarified that the worst-case scenario for this proposal indicates that during the p.m. peak hour (from 5:00 p.m. and during Saturday mid-day), the 95th percentile queue would be only 2 vehicles.

Chairman Straus questioned whether an adjustment of those signals in some manner would have any impact.

Ms. Butorac advised Chairman Straus that due to the distance, the adjustment of those signals would have no substantial impact. She addressed Mr. Tyree's concern with congestion along SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, observing that while this is a congested facility at the present time, even the additional traffic that would be generated by this proposal, according to ODOT and Metro, acceptable standards would still be met.

Mr. Parisi referred to a question with regard to the water quality in Hall Creek, specifically how this issue would be addressed.

Mr. Pessemier pointed out that the vehicles parked in that area have no negative impact on Hall Creek, adding that in addition to reducing impervious areas, the proposal would also provide trap inlet catch basins that are designed to prevent oils from entering system and pollution-control manholes. He pointed out that the detention system is designed to reduce the rate of flow while not necessarily providing for water quality, noting that the applicant feels they are actually creating a positive, rather than negative, impact on Hall Creek.

Mr. Parisi advised Chairman Straus that this is the extent of the applicant's rebuttal.

Ms. Antonio referred to the entrance from SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway into *Montgomery Ward's*, observing that while traveling west, a vehicle could turn right without actually stopping, expressing her opinion that this actually facilitated the movement of traffic. She pointed out that now drivers have to essentially stop at the corner of SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway to make a right-hand turn and questioned whether any consideration had been given to the potential for backed up traffic in this situation.

Assuring Ms. Antonio that this issue had been considered, Ms. Butorac advised her that although the applicant would have preferred to retain that particular access, it is gone, although the queuing would still be within what is considered acceptable parameters.

Chairman Straus mentioned the surface access within the site, specifically referring to trucks turning onto SW 110th Avenue and onto the lot, adding that this would create a fairly complicated maneuver for a good-sized truck, and questioned whether there would be any restrictions on delivery hours that would prevent this situation from impacting the peak hour loads on the streets.

Ms. Butorac informed Chairman Straus that deliveries would occur outside of the peak hours, emphasizing that the drivers prefer not to deal with this congestion.

Ms. Antonio pointed out that she has less concern with the potential congestion at the store than with the congestion on SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, emphasizing that the delivery trucks would slow traffic down.

Noting that she has no concern with congestion on SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, Ms. Butorac pointed out that because the volumes on SW 110th Avenue are relatively low, it would not be necessary for the delivery trucks to sit on SW 110th Avenue waiting to turn into that southerly driveway.

Ms. Antonio questioned whether the delivery trucks would be sitting on SW Beaverton/ Hillsdale Highway waiting to turn onto SW 110th Avenue.

Ms. Butorac observed that although the delivery trucks may be sitting on SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway for a period of time, this would most likely involve only one additional vehicle.

Ms. Antonio pointed out that this additional vehicle is large and takes a long time to make the turn, noting that there would potentially be a number of additional vehicles backing up during that period of time.

Ms. Butorac stated that one of the major functions of SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway is to carry the large vehicles, adding that this is within the character of the traffic flow for this facility.

DAVID KAUTZ, representing *Home Depot, Inc.*, clarified that all deliveries to the store are on an appointment basis and that this process eliminates the potential for trucks to back up into the streets and parking areas with their engines idling, waiting to deliver. Emphasizing that all deliveries are staggered, he noted that the trucks are not permitted to deliver during high-volume traffic hours because this does create a bottleneck effect. He pointed out that he is very happy to work with both Mr. Condray and Mr. Harrington to resolve any parking concerns they have, adding that he would prefer that this not be among the Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Nardozza requested clarification of the anticipated peak hours of operation for *Home Depot*.

Ms. Butorac advised Mr. Nardozza that the major peak hours for *Home Depot* are anticipated to be on Saturdays, in the early afternoons, adding that the weekday p.m. commuter peak hours from 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. would not be as significant.

Mr. Condray pointed out that he still has a major issue with the left turn, adding that one northbound vehicle attempting to turn left into *Home Depot* would effectively prevent any vehicles from entering his driveway.

Chairman Straus informed Mr. Condray that he understands this issue, adding that the Board would deliberate accordingly, and requested that the applicant be more specific in addressing this specific issue.

Ms. Butorac clarified that the delay that had been calculated for the left-hand turn movement for the one vehicle that would occasionally queue there is 7.5 seconds, adding that although approximately 5% of the time, a vehicle would be in front of Mr. Condray's driveway for approximately 7.5 seconds, the driveway would not be blocked for the remaining 95% of the time.

Chairman Straus pointed out that nobody in the City of Beaverton, including Mr. Condray, could be guaranteed open left turns into any specific property or driveway.

Ms. Butorac noted that traffic models could predict the average delay to movement for a driver waiting to turn left into a driveway, reiterating that the average delay for vehicles waiting to turn left into *Home Depot* would be 7.5 seconds. She emphasized that there is very little likelihood that Mr. Condray would experience any difficulty in accessing his property. On question, she advised Chairman Straus that this 7.5 second delay is projected during the Saturday peak hour.

Chairman Straus requested clarification of the more typical delay during normal business hours between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Butorac stated that this delay during normal business hours is obviously much less, adding that this information is in the record and the evidence has already been submitted and accepted by ODOT, Washington County and the City of Beaverton.

Mr. Condray indicated that he had more comments, and was informed by Chairman Straus that because the public testimony portion of the agenda has been completed and this is the time for applicant rebuttal, his comments would not be allowed.

Mr. Beighley mentioned the importance of pointing out that the distance from the north edge of Mr. Condray's northerly driveway to the centerline of the main access point to *Home Depot* is 90 feet.

Mr. Condray again attempted to comment, and Chairman Straus advised him that the Board is aware of his issues and would consider his issues as well as those of the applicant while conducting their deliberations.

As a point of clarification, Mr. Ryerson noted that the distance to the driveway is not 90 feet, adding that the actual main access point into the site is the Harrington property with the driveway on the very south edge, and referred to Plan Sheet SD-5.

Mr. Beighley commented that the actual distance is 90 feet to the centerline.

Mr. Ryerson submitted a highlighted illustration depicting the distance to the driveway.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Observing that this is the time for the deliberation of information applicable to the criteria for this application, Chairman Straus instructed members of the Board to individually comment on their understanding of whether the application is in compliance, adding that this would be followed by a motion to either approve, approve with conditions or deny the application.

Ms. Shipley observed that she approves the application, expressing her opinion that it is in compliance with applicable criteria.

Mr. Edberg requested clarification of how such a development manages to avoid water quality issues that would be required at a new site.

Mr. Ryerson explained that the site is an existing impervious area, adding that because this is considered an existing condition, CWS does not force water quality issues and standards on such an existing impervious surface.

Observing that he has to accept this situation, Mr. Edberg expressed his opinion that the consultants had prepared an appropriate design that meets applicable criteria.

Emphasizing that it is necessary to accept the fact that the traffic situation on SW Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway would not be improved by this project, Ms. Antonio expressed her opinion that the design is appropriate and meets applicable criteria.

Noting that the only issue involving this proposal is the traffic, Mr. Nardoza pointed out that any potential use of this property would generate additional traffic and create some impact, adding that he is satisfied that the proposal meets applicable criteria.

Expressing his agreement with the comments of his fellow Board Members, Mr. Beighley stated that locating this facility on a property that has been vacant for approximately two years would benefit the community and that the proposal meets applicable criteria.

Chairman Straus emphasized that the applicant has taken steps well beyond what is expected, adding that although he has concerns with the traffic issues on SW 110th Avenue, if the traffic studies are accurate in their portrayal of situation, it does not appear that the businesses on the east side of the street would be impacted more than on any other street. He expressed his opinion that the applicant should offer alternative parking options to the other businesses that have lost their parking with this application, and suggested the possibility of considering his recommendation with regard to the tire damage option if signage does not resolve any potential issues that might be created by delivery vehicles.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2001-0155 – Home Depot at Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated January 17, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 27, with Condition of Approval No. 22 amended, as follows:

22. The awning color of the Chuck E. Cheese restaurant building shall be changed to the burgundy color presented on the color board identified as Exhibit “B” ~~a color matching the “Wineberry Red” as found on the Home Depot building.~~

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of November 15, 2001, as written, were submitted. Chairman Straus asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Edberg **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Ms. Antonio, Mr. Nardozza and Ms. Shipley, who abstained from voting on this issue.

The minutes of December 20, 2001, as written, were submitted. Chairman Straus asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Nardozza **MOVED** and Chairman Straus **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Ms. Antonio, Mr. Beighley, Mr. Edberg and Ms. Shipley, who abstained from voting on this issue.

The minutes of January 10, 2002, as written, were submitted. Chairman Straus asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.